



**City of Portland, Oregon**  
**Bureau of Development Services**  
**Inspection Services - Land Use Services**  
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Dan Saltzman, Commissioner  
Paul L. Scarlett, Director  
Phone: (503) 823-7300  
Fax: (503) 823-5630  
TTY: (503) 823-6868  
[www.portlandoregon.gov/bds](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** October 21, 2015  
**To:** Paul Jeffreys, Ankrom Moisan Architects Inc  
**From:** Benjamin Nielsen, City Planner, Development Review  
**Re:** EA 14-234834 DA – Restoration Hardware  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo September 28, 2015

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Landmarks Commission at the September 28, 2015 Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. To review those recordings, please visit: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7058297>.

These Landmarks Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on September 28, 2015. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

Design Advice Requests are not intended to substitute for other Code-required land use or legislative procedures. Please keep in mind that the formal Type III land use review process [which includes a pre-application, a land use review application, public notification, a Staff Report and a public hearing] must be followed once the Design Advice Request meetings are complete, if formal approval for specific elements of your project is desired.

Please continue to coordinate with me as you prepare your formal land use application, or if you desire another Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Landmarks Commission  
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on September 28, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on September 28, 2015: Brian Emerick, Jessica Engeman, Carin Carlson, Harris Matarazzo, Paul Solimano

### **Elevations & Massing**

- The Commissioners discussed, at length, whether the concept and the proposed design of the courtyard is appropriate for the Historic Alphabet District and the retail/mixed-use character of NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. The proposed gated enclosure was a major concern for several of the Commissioners, as was the consideration of future uses of the building (should Restoration Hardware move out). At the end of their discussion, the Commissioners reached a consensus that the courtyard scheme was less-appropriate than the massing in the proposed alternative design, which presented a two-story building mass out at the street-front, rather than having two wings at the street which bound a recessed courtyard. Commissioner Emerick summed up the Commission's reasoning by stating that many of the precedents shown were for residential buildings and that the vibrant urban retail street needs active frontage, not a gated courtyard. The building also becomes more simplified when the building is out at the street, and it is a stronger urban response in that context. The Commission also stated that, while the alternative has the preferred massing (Sheet A10), the detailing from the primary proposal was preferable (specifically referring to the preference for the glass awnings rather than the metal sunshades).

### **Exterior Materials & Detailing**

- The Commissioners considered the glass canopies to be a big aesthetic improvement over the previously proposed slatted sunshades. To them, the glass canopies feel more authentic.
- The window patterning (with a more vertical emphasis and the new, thicker vertical mullions) has moved in a better direction.
- The Commissioners agreed that the east elevation is much-improved over the proposals shown at the previous two hearings.
- The Commissioners again expressed concerns about the proposed tree planters at the edges of the roof deck and whether trees were appropriate at all. A majority expressed an interest in seeing them set back from the edge—that they shouldn't be a dominant visual element. Comments were also made that fully enclosing the parapet, rather than having areas of open railing, would help to both hide the trees and the exterior display area. This last point harkens back to the second DAR hearing in June when Commissioners expressed similar concerns about the visibility of the exterior display on the roof and terraces.
- The trellis at the lower roof terrace should be pulled back against the building rather than set at the parapet edge.
- The Commissioners requested again that the lantern light fixtures proposed for the exterior facades be reduced in size. They called them out of scale and "over-the-top" and stated that they should be more subtle. They also included a reminder to include all other lighting proposed on the roof, including lighting that will be hung or in pergolas. Please include cutsheets.
- The Commissioners asked about the signage and seemed to be approving of the location, size, and back-lighting for the "RH" signs proposed on the west and north facades.
- The Commissioners agreed that pulling the ground level landscaping away from the northwest corner of the building in the proposal was the right move.

### **Exterior Display Areas**

- The Commissioners were concerned about the precedent that could be established by allowing so much exterior display area on the building, especially at the lower roof terraces. They stated that the visual impact needs to be minimized. To do this, the Commissioners stated that the parapets

at both the roof deck and the lower terraces should be completely enclosed rather than open with railings or Juliette balconies.

#### **Parking & Loading**

- The Commissioners thought that the proposed Modification to the L4 landscape standard (transposing the required wall and landscape area) was acceptable.
- The Commissioners thought that the driveway court and loading area overall looked quite nice.
- Commissioner Emerick stated that the roll-up doors should be painted black to match the window system and agreed that they could also be painted the same color as the stucco.
- The Commissioners had no specific comments on the location (or lack of provision of) short-term bicycle parking, so this issue may still need resolution during the Type 3 process.

#### **Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  - 1. Original drawing set
  - 2. Draft drawing set for DAR hearing on April 13, 2015
  - 3. Drawing set for DAR hearing on April 13, 2015
  - 4. Drawing set for DAR hearing on June 8, 2015
  - 5. Draft drawing set for DAR hearing on September 28, 2015
  - 6. Drawing set for DAR hearing on September 28, 2015
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings for September 28, 2015 hearing
  - 1. See *Exhibit A-6*.
- D. Notification
  - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
  - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
  - 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
  - 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
  - 5. Posting instructions sent to applicant for June 8, 2015 hearing
  - 6. Posting notice as sent to applicant for June 8, 2015 hearing
  - 7. Applicant's statement certifying posting for June 8, 2015 hearing
  - 8. Posting instructions sent to applicant for September 28, 2015 hearing
  - 9. Posting notice as sent to applicant for September 28, 2015 hearing
  - 10. Applicant's statement certifying posting for September 28, 2015 hearing
- E. Service Bureau Comments
  - 1. Bureau of Transportation EA appointment response, dated April 10, 2015
- F. Public Testimony
  - 1. Don Genasci on behalf of NWDA Planning Committee, June 8, 2015
- G. Other
  - 1. Application form
  - 2. Memo to Commission, April 3, 2015
  - 3. Staff presentation for April 13, 2015 hearing
  - 4. Summary comments from April 13, 2015 hearing
  - 5. Memo to Commission, May 29, 2015
  - 6. Staff presentation for June 8, 2015 hearing
  - 7. Summary comments from June 8, 2015 hearing
  - 8. Memo to Commission, September 21, 2015
  - 9. Staff presentation for September 28, 2015 hearing